

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the subject application is requested. Claims 1-7, 10-17 and 20 remain in the application. Claims 8, 9, 18 and 19 have been canceled.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the elements of original claims 8 and 9. Claim 10 has been amended to include the elements of original claims 1 and 8. Claim 11 has been amended to include the elements of original claims 18 and 19. Claim 20 has been amended to include the elements of original claims 11 and 18.

In Section 2 of the Detailed Action portion of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6-7, 11-13 and 16-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shimizu et al. (US 2003/0059651).

This rejection is traversed through the amendments of claims 1 and 11, wherein amended claim 1 includes the elements of original claims 8 and 9, and amended claim 11 includes the elements of original claims 18 and 19.

In Section 4 of the Detailed Action portion of the Office Action, claims 4-5 and 14-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al. (US 2003/0059651) in view of Ranjan et al. (US 5840394).

Since claims 4-5 depend from claim 1, and claims 14-15 depend from claim 11, this rejection is traversed through the amendments of claims 1 and 11, wherein amended claim 1 includes the elements of original claims 8 and 9, and amended claim 11 includes the elements of original claims 18 and 19.

In Section 5 of the Detailed Action portion of the Office Action, claims 8 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al. (US 2003/0059651) in view of Yamada et al. (J Appl. Phys., Col. 85, No. 8, 15 April 1999, pp. 5094-96).

This rejection is traversed through the cancellation of claims 8 and 18.

In Section 6 of the Detailed Action portion of the Office Action, claims 9-10 and 19-20 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim; but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

With the above claim amendments, amended claim 1 is equivalent to original claim 9 rewritten in independent form. Claim 10 has been rewritten in independent form. Claim 11 is equivalent to original claim 19 rewritten in independent form. Claim 20 has been rewritten in independent form. All of the other claims depend from either claims 1 or 11.

All claims in the application are believed to be in allowable form. Allowance of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert P Lenart

Robert P. Lenart
Reg. No. 30,654
Pietragallo, Bosick & Gordon
One Oxford Centre, 38th Floor
301 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Telephone: 412-263-4399
Facsimile: 412-261-0915
Attorney for Applicants